UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,650	12/22/2000	Shingo Yamaguchi	49986-0503	9834

29989 7590 09/13/2005

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER	
PHAM, THIERRY L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/747,650	YAMAGUCHI, SHINGO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thierry L. Pham	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-12 and 14-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-12 and 14-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: an Amendment filed on 7/15/05.
- Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23 are pending; claims 2 & 13 have been canceled; claims 20-23 are newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-18, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iida (US 6671063), and in view of Slotznick (US 5983200).

Regarding claim 1, Iida discloses a printing interface apparatus (network facsimile apparatus 201, fig. 2) comprising:

- a printer interface component (network facsimile apparatus 201, fig. 2) that includes a web server (network facsimile apparatus 201 further includes a WWW server section 12, fig. 2 & 4) application configured to receive non-print ready electronic document information (WWW server section 12 further includes a file providing section 35 of fig. 3 for receiving documents/files from client computer, col. 35-58) over a wire connection (via a network as shown in fig. 3), wherein said printer interface component is configured to generate a print ready file (network facsimile 201 further includes a storage processing section 17 for converting the incoming print data into TIFF format, col. 7, lines 10-15 and inherently, before printing any received print data, the facsimile must converts the received data into printable color space and format, i.e. YMCK and PDF, PCL, PostScript, and etc) based on said non-print ready data electronic document information received over a wire connection, and to communicate said generated print ready file to a printing device (printer 6, fig. 2 & 4) for generating a hard copy of said one or more electronic documents.

Iida fails to teach and/or suggest a wireless communication component that is configured to receive electronic document information over a wireless connection.

Slotznick, in the same field of endeavor for printing and network communication, teaches a wireless communication component (kiosk printer communicates with client computer via a wireless communication network as shown in fig. 3) that is configured to receive electronic document information over a wireless connection.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made by modifying a network facsimile apparatus of Iida to include a wireless network communication protocol as taught by Slotznick because of a following reason: (•) to allow a client computer to connect to the network facsimile apparatus wirelessly, therefore, increasing the network flexibility, for example, a user can requests a print job to be printed by a network facsimile from either inside the office and/or outside of the office.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Iida with Slotznick to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 20, Slotznick further teaches the printing interface apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising a payment component (currency receiver 24, fig. 2) that is configured to control the printing of documents by requiring a monetary payment prior to generating said hard copy of said hard copy of said one or more electronic documents.

Regarding claim 3, Slotznick further discloses the printing interface apparatus as recited in claim 20, wherein: the payment component is configured as a magnetic card reader (stand-alone kiosk includes credit card reader, fig. 2) that is capable of reading non-physical payment information as payment for generating said hard copy of said one or more electronic documents.

Regarding claim 4, Slotznick further discloses the printing interface apparatus as recited in claim 20, wherein: the payment component is configured to accept Cyber-Cash (i.e. payment information transmits via a wireless network to stand-alone kiosk, fig. 3, col. 16, lines 18-30)

information over the wireless connection as payment for generating said hard copy of said one or more electronic documents.

Regarding claim 5, Slotznick further discloses the printing interface apparatus as recited in claim 20, wherein: the payment component is configured to accept physical currency (stand-alone kiosk includes currency receiver, fig. 2) as payment for generating said hard copy of said one or more electronic documents.

Regarding claims 6-8, Blue tooth wireless communication (802.11 communication protocol at 2.4 GHz range) is widely known in the art.

Regarding claim 11, Iida discloses a printing interface (network facsimile apparatus 201, fig. 2) comprising:

- a server component (network facsimile apparatus 201, fig. 2) that includes a web server (network facsimile apparatus 201 further includes a WWW server section 12, fig. 2 & 4) that is configured to dynamically generate an electronic document for display on the wired device (i.e. HTML files, col. 4, lines 48-63) wherein the electronic document is based on the received electronic document file and includes a print request selector that allows a user to request a hard copy of said electronic file;
- a printer interface component (network facsimile, fig. 2 & 4) that is configured to communicate a print ready file, based on said electronic document file, to a printing device (network facsimile further includes a printer 6, fig. 2) for generating a hard copy of said electronic document.

Iida fails to teach and/or suggest a wireless communication component that is configured to receive electronic document information over a wireless connection and a payment component that is configured to control the printing of documents by requiring a monetary payment prior to generating hard copy of one or more electronic documents.

Slotznick, in the same field of endeavor for printing and network communication, teaches a wireless communication component (kiosk printer communicates with client computer via a wireless communication network as shown in fig. 3) that is configured to receive electronic

document information over a wireless connection and a payment component (current receiver 24, fig. 2) that is configured to control the printing of documents (printer 42, fig. 2) by requiring a monetary payment prior to generating hard copy of one or more electronic documents. Please also notes; a method/system for wireless communicating between a client computer and a facsimile/printer is widely available and known in the art, and wireless device such as labtop/notebook are widely available and known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made by modifying a network facsimile apparatus of Iida to include a wireless network communication protocol and a payment component as taught by Slotznick because of a following reason: (•) to allow a client computer to connect to the network facsimile apparatus wirelessly, therefore, increasing the network flexibility, for example, a user can requests a print job to be printed by a network facsimile from either inside the office and/or outside of the office; (•) by adding a payment component to the network facsimile, it enables a "fee for service" capability.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Iida with Slotznick to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claims 12, 14-18: Claims 12, 14-18 are the methods corresponding the apparatus and recite limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claims 1-8 and 11; therefore, claims 12, 14-18 are rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1-8, and 11 above.

Regarding claim 21, Iida further teaches the printing interface apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein said printer interface component additionally includes a printer driver compatible with the printer device, wherein said printer driver (printer driver 203, col. 4, lines 25-28) generates the print ready file based on said non-print ready electronic document information received over said wireless connection and communicates said generated print ready file to the printing device. Please notes: since printer driver is computer software, it can be installed on any computer readable medium; in other words, it is well known in the art that printer driver can be installed either on host computer or printer device.

Regarding claim 22, Iida further teaches the printing interface component includes a printer driver compatible with the printer device, and the steps of generating a print ready file based on the non-print ready electronic document information by the printer interface component comprises the printer driver (printer driver 203, col. 4, lines 25-28) generating a print ready file based on the non-print ready electronic document information. Please notes: since printer driver is computer software, it can be installed on any computer readable medium; in other words, it is well known in the art that printer driver can be installed either on host computer or printer device.

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iida and Slotznick as described in claims 1 and/or 12 above, and further in view of Yacoub (U.S. 6452692).

Regarding claims 9 & 19, the combinations of Iida and Slotznick do not disclose wherein the system downloading and installing printer driver via a wireless communication network.

Yacoub, in the same field of endeavor for printing system, teaches the system for downloading and installing printer driver via a wireless network (col. 9, lines 1-16 and col. 12, lines 10-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Iida and Slotznick as per teachings of Yacoub because of a following reason: (•) to increase operating efficiency by downloading and updating the most and current compatible printer driver for printers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Iida and Slotznick with Yacoub to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 & 19.

Claims 10 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slotznick (US 5983200), and in view of Forrest (US 6823172).

Regarding claims 10 & 23, Slotznick discloses a printing interface apparatus (kiosk device including a printer interface, fig. 3) comprising:

• a wireless communication component (transmission system including satellite communication 68, fig. 3) that is configured with a receiving component (modem 46, fig. 3) for receiving electronic document information over a wireless network (receiving documents from remote device via using a wireless network, fig. 3), wherein the wireless component includes a front side and a back side (inherently, all modems include a front/back/top side); and

• a printer interface component (CPU 34, fig. 3) that is configured to communicate said electronic document information to a printing device (output device 42 including printer, fig. 3) for generating a hard copy of one or more electronic documents based on said electronic document information.

Slotznick discloses a wireless communication device, but fails to teach a method for shielding a receiving component to limit reception only to those devices that are located substantially in front of a wireless communication component.

Forrest, in the same field of endeavor for kiosk device using wireless communication components, teaches a method for shielding (an absorbing shield wall for limiting wireless signal transmission, col. 2, lines 1-5 and col. 6, lines 1-15) a receiving component to limit reception only to those devices that are located substantially in front of a wireless communication component.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made by modifying a kiosk device of Slotznick to include an absorbing shield wall to limit the wireless signal transmission as taught by Forrest because of a following reason: (•) to prevent wireless signal from leaking to unauthorized users; (•) to prevent other wireless signals from interfering with signals from kiosk device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Slotznick with Forrest to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

Response to Arguments

• Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-10, filed 7/15/05, with respect to claims 3-5, 17-18 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of claims 3-5, 17-18 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/15/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

• Regarding claims 1, 11, and 12, the applicant argued cited prior art of record (US 6671063 to Iida) fails to teach and/or suggest a printer interface component that includes a web server application configured to receive non-print ready document information over and a printer interface component is configured to generate a print ready file based on said non-print ready electronic document information received, and to communicate said generated print ready file to a printing device for generating a hard copy as cited in claims 1, 11, and 12; in other words, the applicant argued Iida fails to teach and/or suggest printer interface component for receiving non-print ready document information sent from wireless devices and to convert "non-print ready" document information into "print ready format" that is compatible with output device (i.e. printer). In addition, the applicant argued the conversion (i.e. converting from non-print ready to print ready) is performed at the client computer rather than at the print interface apparatus (i.e. printer). On page 11 of Remarks, the applicant states "web server 346 receives the non-print ready electronic document information from the wireless interface 344, and sends the information to the printer driver 350 in the interface box for generation of a print ready file for printer device 336".

In response, the examiner disagrees with applicant's assertions/arguments. First, the examiner would like to point out that there is a clearly difference between a web server application and a web server. A web server application is a computer-software and a web server is a hardware device. The examiner fails to find any portion of the original filed specification that teaches "a web server application configured to receive non-print ready electronic document information to print ready file". On page 13, line 1 of original filed specification that teaches "a web server application 352" incorporated within a wireless interface 344. However, none of the figures show any reference to web server application 352. Herein, the examiner interprets web server application as "WWW server section 12" as shown in fig. 2 & 4 by Iida. WWW server 12 includes plurality of applications as shown in fig. 4. Secondly, the applicants repeatedly argued the cited prior art of record fails to teach and/or suggest receiving non-print ready document information. The examiner fails to locate any teachings and/or terms relating to "non-print ready" within any portion of the specification. Herein, the examiner interprets document print

data such as bit map (col. 9, lines 10-15), word document (col. 6, lines 13-16) file sent from client computer as "non-print ready". These documents then sent to network printer 201 (fig. 3) from client computer 202 (fig. 3). These documents are then converted to different formats, for example, TIFF, HTML, and etc at the network printer (cols. 3-4). Finally, statement presented by the applicant "web server 346 receives the non-print ready electronic document information from the wireless interface 344, and sends the information to the printer driver 350 in the interface box for generation of a print ready file for printer device 336" is nowhere to be found within any portion of original filed specification. ***Claim 1 clearly indicates a print ready file is generated by a printer interface component and not by web server application, and please notes that nowhere within the specification that teaches a web server application for converting print data.*** It is known in the art, prior to output any print data onto a physical page (i.e. print media), the print data is converted to a compatible output format such as YMCK, and such print data is converted by the printer. Also, Iida also teaches plurality of printer drivers (fig. 6, col. 6, lines 13-24). It is known in the art that these drivers are for converting print data into compatible format such as PostScript, PDL, PCL, and etc. Since printer driver is a computer-software, therefore, it can be installed on any hardware devices that contain a computer readable medium such as host computer, printer, facsimile, server, and etc.

• Regarding claim 10, the applicant argued cited prior art of record (US 6823172 to Forrest) fails to teach and/or suggest any directional shielding. In other words, the applicant argued Forrest's shield is applied only to internal walls of the ATM rather than to limit document information from only those devices located substantially in front of the wireless communication device.
In response, the examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments. Forrest teaches an ATM (fig. 1) with RF shield walls for shielding any signals from leaking outside of ATM. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement these shields to direct signals in direction of desired. For example, to limit reception of the receiving component to those devices that are located substantially in front of the wireless component, one of ordinary skill in the art just simply removes the front shield wall and replace with non-shield wall. By doing so, signals will only transmits to devices that are located substantially in front of the ATM. Notes that both Slotznick and Forrest are drawn to the same field of endeavor for customer kiosk/ATM.

To limit reception of only to those devices those are substantially located in front of Slotznick customer kiosk, simply replaces back/top/bottom/sides non-shielding walls (fig. 1 of Slotznick) with shielding walls as taught by Forrest.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- U.S. 6113208 to Benjamin et al teaches an example wherein a printer driver is installed within a printer.
- U.S. 5577268 to Ho et al teaches a RF shielding clips for use in a communication device.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-7439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thierry L. Pham

TP

Gabriel Garcia

GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER